



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,114	11/21/2001	Chun-Chieh Wang	147268.00323	1298

7590

07/15/2003

POWELL, GOLDSTEIN, FRAZER & MURPHY LLP
P.O. BOX 97223
WASHINGTON, DC 20090-7223

EXAMINER

LUK, EMMANUEL S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1722

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/989,114

Applicant(s)

WANG ET AL.

Examiner

Emmanuel S. Luk

Art Unit

1722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 1722

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1722

4. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Von Holdt.

Von Holdt teaches the claimed apparatus having a mold structure having a mold plunger and a mold cavity (30,50) to seal with the mold plunger, a female and male mold core (28,34) mounted on the cavity and the plunger respectively, the female core can be replaced with another mold core. The structure allows for interchangeable mold cores to varying press machines (Col. 2, lines 19-24).

Von Holdt fails to teach the mold for making an external network adapter and replacing female mold cores with different textures.

In regards to the external network adapter, this is an intended use of an apparatus. The structure itself can be used to form products depending on the preference of the user and the intended use in the preamble does not positively limit the claimed structure. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus taught by Von Holdt to be used in creating external network adapters.

In regards to the female mold cores, Von Holdt teaches the female mold core being able to be placed on varying mold presses. Thus it is obvious to one skilled in the art that the interchangeability of the core with the various presses of different sizes can also be applied with various mold cores with different shapes and sizes on the mold apparatus. Additionally, the change in texture for molding is merely a change in shape and size and this is merely a design choice. In re Dailey et al, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Von Holdt

Art Unit: 1722

with various different mold cores to be placed into the apparatus because of the application of a modular design in the molding apparatus.

5. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sasai et al.

Sasai teaches the claimed apparatus having a mold structure having a mold plunger and a mold cavity (21, 22) to seal with the mold plunger, a female and male mold core (24,29) mounted on the cavity and the plunger respectively, the male core can be replaced with another male mold core (Col. 2, lines 9-44).

Sasai fails to teach the mold for making an external network adapter, the female core being replaced with another female core and the texture of the female mold core.

In regards to the external network adapter, this is an intended use of an apparatus. The structure itself can be used to form products depending on the preference of the user and the intended use in the preamble does not positively limit the claimed structure. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus taught by Sasai to be used in creating external network adapters.

In regards to the female mold cores, Sasai teaches the male mold core being able to be placed on varying mold presses. Thus it is obvious to one skilled in the art that the interchangeability of the male core with the various shapes can also be applied to the female mold core. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Sasai with various different female mold cores to be placed into the apparatus because of the application of a modular design in the molding apparatus.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hanas et al, Hendrickson et al, Neu and Von Holdt, Sr.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emmanuel S. Luk whose telephone number is (703) 305-1558. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8 to 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda L. Walker can be reached on (703) 308-0457. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9310 for regular communications and (703) 872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0651.

E.L.
June 30, 2003


W. L. WALKER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700